Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

97 • 316 AUG 2 0 1997

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. ———

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States
OCTOBER TERM, 1996

CAPTAIN ADRIENNE M. HALL,
Petitioner

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces

---

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

CAROL L. HUBBARD
Major, United States Air Force
Appellate Defense Counsel
Counsel of Record

DOUGLAS H. KOHRT
Colonel, United States Air Force
Chief, Appellate Defense Division
Counsel for Petitioner

Air Force Legal Services Agency
Appellate Defense Division
112 Luke Avenue, Suite 343
Bolling AFB DC 20332-8000
(202) 767-1562

August 1997

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the military judge committed plain error by instructing the members about collateral consequences of a court-martial conviction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION	4
CONCLUSION	9
APPENDIX A	
(Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces)	1a
APPENDIX B	
(Opinion of the United States Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals)	6a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Military Cases: Page

United States v. Cleckley, 8 U.S.C.M.A. 83, 23 C.M.R. 307 (1957) 6

United States v. Fisher, 21 M.J. 327 (C.M.A. 1986) 7

United States v. Grady, 30 M.J. 911 (A.C.M.R. 1990), pet. denied, 32 M.J. 197 (C.M.A. 1990) .. 7

United States v. Griffin, 25 M.J. 423 (C.M.A. 1988), cert. denied, 487 U.S. 1206 (1988) 3, 4, 5, 8

United States v. Hall, 46 M.J. 145 (1997) 3

United States v. McElroy, 40 M.J. 368 (C.M.A. 1994) 7, 8

United States v. McLaren, 34 M.J. 926 (A.F.C.M.R. 1992), *aff'd*, 38 M.J. 112 (C.M.A. 1993), cert. denied, —— U.S. ——, 114 S.Ct. 1056 (1994) 4, 5, 6

United States v. Quesinberry, 12 U.S.C.M.A. 609, 31 C.M.R. 195 (1962) 4

Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1984 (1995 ed.)

Mil. R. Evid. (M.R.E.) 402 8

Rules for Courts-Martial (R.C.M.) 801(c) 5

Federal Statutes:

10 U.S.C. § 867(a)(3) 2, 3

28 U.S.C. § 1259(3) 2

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1996

No ———

CAPTAIN ADRIENNE M. HALL,
Petitioner

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces

---

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

The petitioner, Captain Adrienne M. Hall, respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the order and judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces entered in her case on 9 June 1997.

OPINIONS BELOW

The order and judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, reported at *United States v. Hall*, 46 M.J. 145 (1997), is located at Appendix A. The unpublished opinion of the United States Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals (A.F. Ct. Crim. App., 17 June 1996) is located at Appendix B.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces was entered on 9 June 1997. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1259(3) (West Supp. 1996) and 10 U.S.C. § 867(a)(3) (West Supp. 1996).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED

The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides, in relevant part:

> "No person shall . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . ."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On 18 August 1994, pursuant to her pleas, petitioner was convicted of the wrongful use of methamphetamine in violation of Article 112a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. In their sentencing arguments before the panel of members, both trial and defense counsel focused on whether or not petitioner, a veteran of 19 years and 8 months, should be dismised from the service. Basically, a dismissal was all the Government asked for, Record 98; it was what the Defense argued most forcefully against. Record 100. After deliberating for more than an hour, the members returned to the courtroom with a question: "Should the accused be dismissed from the Air Force, what benefits would she be entitled to as a dependent?" Record 108; App. Ex. X. (This question was asked in reference to petitioner's husband being a retired Air Force officer. Record 108.) The question was hand-written on an otherwise blank sheet of paper, with no indications on it or in the record of any opportunity afforded either trial or defense counsel to review the question and note any objection they might have to it before the military judge replied:

> "The response to that is, her conviction by this court or any sentence imposed by this court, including a dismissal, would not affect any benefits she would be entitled to as a dependent of a retired military person. In other words, those might be use of commissary, use of BX, medical benefits, as any other dependent of a retired military person." Record 108.

Having answered the question with substantive information that appeared facially accurate, the military judge asked whether either counsel had "any quarrel with that point of view." Record 108. Both counsel replied in the negative. *Id.* Twenty-nine minutes later the members returned and announced their sentence: dismissal from the service. Record 109.

On 17 June 1996, the Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals affirmed the findings and sentence. App. B, *infra.* The court stated that [o]rdinarily, the appropriate remedy for a military judge faced with such a question is to simply affirm that 'collateral consequences are not germane' to the sentencing process," quoting *United States v. Griffin*, 25 M.J. 423, 424 (C.M.A. 1988), cert. denied, 487 U.S. 1206 (1988). However, the court failed to find plain error as it found the military judge was essentially correct, and the trial defense counsel did not request additional instructions. On 8 January 1997, the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces granted review of the decision of the Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 867(a)(3). On 9 June 1997, the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces affirmed the lower court's decision. The court ruled that the petitioner failed to satisfy her burden of showing that an obvious, substantial error occurred and that the error had an unfairly prejudicial impact on her case. *United States v. Hall*, 46 M.J. 145, 147 (1997).

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

"The general rule concerning collateral consequences of a sentence is that 'courts-martial [are] to concern themselves with the appropriateness of a particular sentence for an accused and his offense, without regard to the collateral administrative effects of the penalty under consideration.' " *United States v. Griffin*, 25 M.J. 423, 424 (C.M.A. 1988), cert. denied, 487 U.S. 1206 (1988); quoting *United States v. Quesinberry*, 12 U.S.C.M.A. 609, 612, 31 C.M.R. 195, 198 (1962). While it is not necessarily error for a military judge to answer court members' questions on collateral consequences of particular sentences—

> "[m]ilitary judges must tread carefully when responding to a court member's question on such matters. Ordinarily, the appropriate reply is simply to affirm that 'collateral consequences are not germane' to the sentencing process. *Griffin*, 25 M.J. at 424. **With the accused's permission**, though, the judge may venture further. However, that path is fraught with hazards. The answer must be clear, despite the extemporaneity of the occasion. *Id.* It must also be accurate and complete. This is of particular concern, since military judges are less likely to be fully informed as to collateral consequences. *Griffin*, 25 M.J. at 425 (concurring opinion by Everett, C.J.). Finally, the potential for unnecessary confusion, resulting from inundating the members with administrative trivia, must be avoided. *Quesinberry*, 12 U.S.C.M.A. at 612, 31 C.M.R. at 198; *see* Mil. R. Evid. 403."

United States v. McLaren, 34 M.J. 926, 934 n.9 (A.F.C.M.R. 1992) (emphasis added), aff'd, 38 M.J. 112 (C.M.A. 1993), cert. denied, —— U.S. ——, 114 S.Ct. 1056 (1994).

Ignoring the appellate courts' repeated pronouncements that military judges should simply affirm that collateral consequences are not germane to members' sentencing

considerations, the military judge in the instant case proceeded *sua sponte* and **without the permission of the accused** to provide the members with a substantive response to their question on the collateral consequences of a dismissal vis-à-vis petitioner's dependent military benefits by virtue of her marital status. When a military judge contemplates providing the court with such information, he must obtain permision from the defense before doing so. The Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces has made this requirement emphatically known when it stated (in italics) that a military judge does not err in answering members' questions "*if an accused agrees.*" *Griffin, supra.*

In the instant case, after the military judge announced the members' question in open court, he answered it directly without first convening an Article 39(a) session or even inquiring as to any objections by counsel. Rules for Courts-Martial 801(c). Rather than follow the advice of *McLaren, supra*, to "tread carefully" in responding to such questions, the military judge answered the question. Only **thereafter** did the military judge ask counsel whether they had "any quarrel with that point of view."

Even this question was not one asking whether defense counsel thought the question should have been answered, the question asked whether counsel disagreed with the substantive correctness of the information provided to the members. That substance having, at that moment, been apparently correct (and the "bell having already been rung"), both counsel indicated that they had no "quarrel with that point of view."

What the judge didn't say is just as devastating as what he did. Having answered the substance of the members' question, the military judge failed to instruct them that this information was not to be taken into account in adjudging an appropriate sentence for petitioner. Cf. *United States v. McLaren*, 34 M.J. at 933 (military judge answers question and then concludes by saying "you can't

take that into consideration in adjudging what you believe to be an appropriate sentence.") As the Air Force Court noted in *McLaren, supra*, once a judge takes it upon himself to provide a collateral consequence instruction, his instruction thereon must be complete. Indeed, the *McLaren* Court closed its discussion of this issue by concluding that the judge's **explicit** guidance to not consider any extraneous matters was appropriate and adequate to preclude any improper consideration by the members. (emphasis added). *McLaren* at 934.

As a practical matter, the information conveyed to the members by the military judge was that if the members felt petitioner deserving of her military retirement benefits (i.e. medical care, use of the commissary and the base exchange), they needn't worry about a dismissal depriving her of them because she would still have access to such benefits as the dependent of a military retiree. The impropriety of considering a similar type of collateral information was addresed in *United States v. Cleckley*, 8 U.S.C.M.A. 83, 23 C.M.R. 307 (1957). As the Court stated, ". . . the authority of a fiscal agent of the Federal Government acting under a separate law to pay or not to pay the accused is a matter which cannot be tossed into military law to befuddle sentences authorized by the Code." *Cleckley* at 309.

Further, petitioner's entitlement to dependent military benefits was/is contingent upon her remaining married to her husband, a military retiree. Should they divorce, she will lose the vestigial benefits the members apparently intended her to retain following her almost twenty years of exemplary service. As reflected in her unsworn statement, there have been difficulties in the marriage, Record 92; although at the time of trial, counseling had improved their relationship, Record 93, a divorce between the two remains a distinct possibility. Should this occur, petitioner will lose the military benefits the members obviously thought her deserving of.

If the rule avoiding consideration of collateral consequences without the consent of the accused had been followed in the instant case, the members would have been forced to decide whether petitioner was deserving of military benefits based upon **her** service record and the offense she committed. They would not have been allowed to avoid this issue by defaulting to her status as a dependent wife. As it were, the military judge effectively allowed the members to decide whether to dismiss the petitioner, based not upon her service record, but upon that of her husband. This was plain error. See *United States v. Grady*, 30 M.J. 911, 916-917 (A.C.M.R. 1990) (military judge erred in apparently constructing a sentence with sufficient time in confinement to ensure appellant would be confined at Ft. Leavenworth based upon the collateral matter of drug treatment programs available there), pet. denied, 32 M.J. 197 (C.M.A. 1990).

Plain error is an obvious and substantial error having an unfair prejudicial impact on a jury's deliberations. *United States v. Fisher*, 21 M.J. 327, 328-29 (C.M.A. 1986). In the instant case, the military judge completely ignored extant precedent stating that members' questions involving collateral consequences are generally not to be answered; if they are, permisison from the defense must be obtained first. Failing entirely to address this requirement of obtaining the accused's consent, the Air Force Court found no plain error because the military judge's response was substantively correct and defense counsel requested no further instruction. Though the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces recently declined to find plain error after a defense counsel failed to object to a proposed sentencing instruction on vested Veterans Affairs benefits, the defense counsel in that case had the opportunity to object before the instruction was given to the members. *United States v. McElroy*, 40 M.J. 368 (C.M.A. 1994). Further, the *McElroy* court again affirmed the general rule that instructions on collateral ad-

ministrative consequences should be avoided. *McElroy* at 372.

The Air Force Court erred in examining the accuracy (or inaccuracy) of the Judge's pronouncement of the collateral information as the Court's approach overlooked the real feature at issue: the information is **collateral** and, by definition, irrelevant (and therefore inadmissible, Mil. R. Evid. 402). Members are generally precluded from considering collateral consequences because they are not a germane consideration to the issues at hand, not because the information can be accurately presented to the court-martial. Whether petitioner might in some other way indirectly qualify for military benefits that a dismisal would deprive her of was not an appropriate concern for the panel as they were tasked with deciding an appropriate punishment for this accused and her offense.

Against the black and white background of *Griffin*, the error of the military judge is plain. The military judge pronounced in absolute terms that the petitioner would be able to use BX, Commissary benefits, etc. though he failed to account for possible action by other authorities to deny petitioner access to such benefits. Further, the error is substantial in that it led to an improper foundation for decision of the only issue in the case: petitioner's sentence. The unfair, prejudicial impact on the members' deliberations is evident from their termination of an outstanding career spanning almost tweny years, based not upon the merits of that career, but upon the retirement eligibility of another to whom petitioner may not ultimately remain married.

CONCLUSION

The military judge committed plain error that had an unfairly prejudicial impact on her case. Despite a rule specifying that a courts-martial panel not be informed of collateral consequences associated with adjudged sentences, the military judge told the panel in the case *sub judice* that petitioner's conviction and sentence would not affect any benefits she would be entitled to as a dependent of a retired military member. Only after the judge violated this long-standing prohibition on discussing collateral consequences did he ask counsel if they "had any quarrel with that point of view." Though neither counsel objected, the information was already before the panel, having issued forth from the military judge himself. The panel was required to concern itself "with the appropriateness of a particular sentence for an accused and his offense, without regard to the collateral administrative effects of the penalty under consideration." In giving the panel impermissible information, the military judge committed an obvious and substantial error. The record of trial demonstrates the resulting unfair prejudice to the petitioner from this plain error. Having come within four months of being eligible to retire from the United States Air Force, petitioner put on a strong sentencing case. The panel then entered its closed session deliberations, but after one hour, returned to open court to ask the military judge what impact a dismissal would have upon petitioner's benefits as a dependent of a retiree. After hearing the military judge's answer, the panel resumed their deliberations, reaching a sentence in twenty-nine minutes—a dismissal from the Air Force. The nature of the deliberations and the sentence announced indicate the petitioner has met her burden of showing that an obvious, substantial error took place in her August 1994 trial and that the error of the military judge had an unfairly prejudicial impact on her case.

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

CAROL L. HUBBARD
Major, United States Air Force
Appellate Defense Counsel
Counsel of Record

DOUGLAS H. KOHRT
Colonel, United States Air Force
Chief, Appellate Defense Division
Counsel for Petitioner

Air Force Legal Services Agency
Appellate Defense Division
112 Luke Avenue, Suite 343
Bolling AFB DC 20332-8000
(202) 767-1562

August 1997

APPENDIX A

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ARMED FORCES.

UNITED STATES,
Appellee,

v.

ADRIENNE M. HALL, Captain Air Force,
Appellant.

No. 96-1240
Crim. App. No. 31483.

Submitted March 5, 1997.
Decided June 9, 1997.

Accused was convicted by general court-martial, Dennis E. Kansala J., of wrongful use of methamphetamines. The United States Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals affirmed. Review was granted. The United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, Cox, C.J., held that challenge to instruction on collateral matter was waived by lack of objection.

Affirmed.

Opinion of the Court

COX, Chief Judge:

Captain Hall was tried by a general court-marial with members at Oflutt Air Force Base, Nebraska. Pursuant to her pleas, she was found guilty of wrongful use of methamphetamines, in violation of Article 112a, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 USC § 912a. During deliberations on sentence, the military judge, "Should the accused be dismised from the Air Force, what benefits would she be entitled to as a dependent?" Captain Hall is the spouse of a military retiree. The military judge instructed the members as follows:

> The response to that is, her conviction by this court or any sentence imposed by this court, including a dismissal, would not affect any benefits she would be entitled to as a dependent of a retired military person. In other words, those might be use of commissary, use of BX, medical benefits, as any other dependent of a retired military person.

Having given the above instruction, the military judge then asked whether either counsel had "any quarrel with that point of view." Both the prosecution and the defense replied in the negative.

Captain Hall was sentenced to dismissal from the Air Force, without any other punishment. We granted review of the following issue:

> WHETHER THE AIR FORCE COURT ERRED IN IMPLICITLY HOLDING THAT WHERE A MILITARY JUDGE VIOLATES *UNITED STATES V. GRIFFIN*, 25 MJ 423 (CMA 1988) BY ANSWERING A MEMBER'S QUESTION ABOUT COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCES WITHOUT HAVING PROCURED THE ACCUSED'S AGREEMENT TO SUCH A RESPONSE, THERE CAN BE NO PLAIN ERROR IF THE JUDGE'S AN-

SWER WAS ESSENTIALLY CORRECT AND DEFENSE COUNSEL REQUESTED TO INSTRUCTION TO DISREGARD IT; i.e., WHETHER *GRIFFIN* MEANS WHAT IT SAYS, THAT A MILITARY JUDGE MAY ONLY ANSWER MEMBERS' QUESTIONS REGARDING COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCES "IF AN ACCUSED AGREES."

[1] This Court has repeatedly held that collateral consequenes of a court-martial conviction should not be the concern of the court-martial and that instructions thereon should be avoided. *United States v. McElroy*, 40 MJ 368, 371-72 (CMA 1994); *United States v. Griffin*, 25 MJ 423 (CMA 1988). We agree with Chief Judge Everett's observation in his separate opinion in *Griffiin* that "the collateral consequences of a sentence—or even of a conviction—cannot always be foreseen." 25 MJ at 425. "On the other hand, it is . . . not error" for a military judge "to answer the members' questions *if an accused agrees.*" 25 MJ at 424. It is equally clear that these collateral consequences continue to be a concern to members of a court-martial, for numerous reasons. As this Court observed in *Griffin:*

> First, in reality, the impact of an adjudged punishment on the benefits due an accused who is eligible to retire is often the single most important sentencing matter to that accused and the sentencing authority. Thus, it is only in a theoretical sense that the effect a punitive discharge has on retirement benefits can be labeled collateral. Moreover, the impact on benefits —whatever it may be—can only be a direct and proximate consequence of the sentence.

25 MJ at 424.

[2] Captain Hall was tried on August 18, 1994. She made an unsworn statement to the members that she had

prior enlisted service, had obtained a commission through ROTC, had married an individual who was then retired from the Air Force, and was eligible to retire from the Air Force on December 4, 1994. She asked the court members to impose punishment only on herself and not on her family. The military judge, without objection, instructed the members that a dismissal could deprive appellant "of substantially all benefits administered by the Veterans Administration and the Air Force establishment."

We have recently addressed the issue of instructing on retirement benefits in *United States v. Sumrall*, 45 MJ 207 (1996); *see United States v. Graves*, 46 MJ 133 (1997). It is clear that members of courts-martial, military judges, and the parties do not consider loss of these benefits to be collateral or immaterial. However, we need not address this issue, because we conclude that objections to the military judge's instruction were waived by failure of appellant to object or seek a curative instruction. *See McElroy, supra* at 372 (waiver by failure to object); *United States v. Griffin, supra*. The sentence will be set aside only if the instruction by the military judge constituted plain error.

[3-5] Plain error is a doctrine that "is to be used sparingly, solely in those circumstances in which a miscarriage of justice would otherwise result." *United States v. Strachan*, 35 MJ 362, 364 (CMA 1992), quoting *United States v. Fisher*, 21 MJ 327, 328-29 (CMA 1986), *quoting United States v. Frady*, 456 U.S. 152, 163 n. 14, 102 S.Ct 1584, 1592 n. 14, 71 L.Ed.2d 816 (1982). "To establish plain error, appellant must demonstrate: that there was 'error'; that such error was 'plain, clear, or obvious'; and that the error 'affect[ed]' appellant's 'substantial rights.' " *United States v. Czekala*, 42 MJ 168, 170 (1995), quoting *United States v. Olano*, 507 U.S. 725, 732, 734, 113 S.Ct. 1770, 1777-78, 123 L.Ed.2d 508 (1993). Appellant has failed to satisfy her burden of showing that an obvious, substantial error occurred and

that the error had an unfairly prejudicial impact on her case. *United States v. Strachan, supra.*

The decision of the United States Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals is affirmed.

Judges SULLIVAN, CRAWFORD, GIERKE, and EFFRON concur.

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

ACM 31483

UNITED STATES

v.

CAPTAIN ADRIENNE M. HALL, 572-98-0554FV
United States Air Force

---

17 June 1996

Sentence adjudged 18 August 1994 by GCM convened at Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska. Military Judge: Dennis E. Kansala.

Approved sentence: Dismissal.

Appellate Counsel for Appellant: Captain Todi S. Garnes (argued), Colonel Jay L. Cohen, and Freddy B. Ruiz.

Appellate Counsel for the United States: Captain Libby A. Brown (argued), Colonel Jeffrey T. Infelise, and Lieutenant Colonel Michael J. Breslin.

Before

HEIMBURG, GAMOA, and SENANDER
Appellate Military Judges

OPINION OF THE COURT

SENANDER, Judge:

The appellant was convicted, by a general court-martial, in accordance with her pleas of wrongful use of methamphetamine. Article 112a, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 912a (1994). Her approved sentence is a dismissal. Appellant asserts two errors by the military judge: his incorrect ruling that admission of certain defense exhibits would permit the government to offer appellant's confession; and his failure to give proper instructions. The appellant also alleges that she received ineffective assistance from her trial defense counsel, and that the sentence was inappropriately severe. We find none of her arguments persuasive and affirm.

The appellant was randomly selected on February 8, 1994, for urinalysis testing. Her sample tested positive for the methamphetamine metabolite. When questioned by agents of the Air Force Office of Special Investigations, she confessed to use of methamphetamine during January 1994. She additionally told agents she used methamphetamine during 1988 and 1989, another stressful period in her life.

I. EXCLUSION OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE

Trial defense counsel made a motion *in limine* to exclude the use by trial counsel of that portion of the appellant's confession which related to the uncharged misconduct in 1988 and 1989 and the two purchases of amphetamines. The motion was made to preclude trial counsel from using these statements from appellant's confession in rebuttal to certain character letters which the de-

fense intended to introduce. The appellant asserts that the character letters in question were substitutes for an Officer Performance Report for the period May 16, 1993 to August 18, 1994, and that no rebuttal should have been permitted, since trial counsel was required to present evidence of duty performance. R.C.M. 1001(a)(1)(A)(ii).

During an Article 39(a), 10 U.S.C. § 839(a) (1994), session the military judge stated that he believed the letters in question contained statements that would make them character letters rather than merely statements of duty performance from May 16, 1993 to August 18, 1994. The military judge specifically found the character letters would open the door to rebuttal by evidence of prior uncharged drug use because the letters portrayed the appellant as a good military officer and a professional, and reflected numerous qualities of leadership.

The military judge gave the trial defense counsel the opportunity to redact those portions of the statements which covered the appellant's entire career rather than the period May 16, 1993 to August 18, 1994. If the trial defense counsel had redacted the statements as suggested, it appears likely that the military judge would not have permitted appellant's confession to methamphetamine use in 1988 and 1989 to be used as rebuttal. However, the appellant did not offer the character letters in any form. Therefore, there was no evidence for the trial counsel to attempt to rebut. Trial defense counsel basically requested the military judge to give an advisory opinion, and when his preliminary opinion was not favorable, the defense counsel decided not to offer the character letters. Failure to offer the exhibits waived any issue. *See United States v. Gee*, 39 M.J. 311 (C.M.A. 1993) (Failure to call character witnesses barred review of denial of defense motion *in limine* to prevent cross examination of character witnesses on their knowledge of appellant's drug use). This assignment of error is rejected.

II. IMPROPER SENTENCING INSTRUCTIONS

During sentence deliberations the President of the court-martial panel asked the following question: "Should the accused be dismissed from the Air Force, what benefits would she be entitled to as a dependent. That being because her husband is a retired member of the Air Force." The military judge responded: "Her conviction by this court, including a dismissal, would not affect any benefits she would be entitled to as a dependent of a retired military person. In other words, those might be use of commissary, use of BX, medical benefits, as any other dependent of a retired military person. Does that answer the question?" The military judge then asked: "Does counsel for either side have any quarrel with that point of view?" Both counsel answered in the negative.

Appellant asserts for the first time on appeal that the military judge committed plain error by answering the President's question. The standard of review for sentencing instructions is whether the military judge abused his discretion in giving or failing to give an instruction. *United States v. Dubose*, 19 M.J. 877 (A.F.C.M.R. 1985), *pet. denied*, 21 M.J. 147 (C.M.A. 1985). Absent a timely objection, an error in sentencing instructions is waived unless such error rises to the level of "plain error." *United States v. Griffin*, 25 M.J. 423 (C.M.A. 1988), *cert. denied*, 487 U.S. 1206, 108 S.Ct. 2849 (1988). In order to constitute plain error, appellant must show that an obvious, substantial error occurred and that the error had an unfairly prejudicial impact on his case. *United States v. Strachan*, 35 M.J. 362, 364 (C.M.A. 1992), *cert. denied*, 507 U.S. 990, 113 S.Ct. 1595 (1993).

Ordinarily, the appropriate reply for a military judge faced with such a question is to simply to affirm that "collateral consequences are not germane" to the sentencing process. *Griffin*, 25 M.J. at 424. The trial defense counsel waived any objection, however, by indicating he had

no quarrel with the military judge's answer. We find no plain error: the military judge's answer was essentially correct, and trial defense counsel did not request further instructions. To establish plain error, the appellant must also establish the error had an unfair impact on the courts members' deliberations. *United States v. Fisher*, 21 M.J. 327, 328 (C.M.A. 1986). We find there is no reasonable probability that the members would not have adjudged a dismissal. Illegal drug use has long been considered a serious offense and particularly perilous for officers, who are expected to set the standards for others to follow. *United States v. Holt*, 28 M.J. 835 (A.F.C.M.R. 1989), *pet. denied*, 28 M.J. 434 (C.M.A. 1989). This assignment of error is without merit.

III. INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL

Appellant asserts that her trial defense counsel were ineffective by failing to investigate appellant's mental and medical history. Appellant argues that her husband had informed trial defense counsel that appellant should be evaluated by a psychiatrist due to emotional and physical problems of which they were not aware. Specifically, appellant was diagnosed after trial as having a sleep disorder. She now contends that the use of amphetamines was necessitated by her inability to sleep at night and the need to be alert to function during duty hours. Appellant believes if the court members had been made aware of her sleep disorder they would not have imposed a dismissal.

Trial defense counsel responded to the allegation by affidavit in which he described a comment by appellant's husband that "there was a history there that we [defense counsel] were not aware of." The husband would not elaborate when asked what he meant and the appellant sat silent. Trial defense counsel affirmed the defense strategy, approved by appellant, was to ensure that the members saw her usage as a one-time foolish response to

a stressful situation. This was a sound strategy and, in our opinion, was superior to appellate defense counsel's argument, that appellant's long time use of methamphetamine resulted from a sleep disorder.

The standard for measuring a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel is set forth by the Supreme Court in *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 687 (1984). *See also United States v. Scott*, 24 M.J. 186 (C.M.A. 1987). Appellant must show counsel's performance was deficient and also show resulting prejudice. We find no evidence that trial defense counsel's performance was deficient. Trial defense counsel's strategy was reasonable and therefore does not support appellant's claim of ineffectiveness of counsel. *United States v. Mansfield*, 24 M.J. 611, 617 (A.F.C.M.R. 1987). Tactical decisions will not be second-guessed. *United States v. Sanders*, 37 M.J. 116, 118 (C.M.A. 1993), *cert. denied*, —— U.S. ——, 114 S.Ct. 600 (1993). We reject this assignment of error.

IV. SENTENCE APPROPRIATENESS

Appellant argues that her sentence is in excess of what is appropriate in this case given her superior duty performance, her sleep disorder and methamphetamine addiction. Under Article 66(c), UCMJ, our statutory mandate is to determine sentence appropriateness to ensure that justice is done. *United States v. Healy*, 26 M.J. 394 (C.M.A. 1988). A higher standard of conduct may be required of officers because of their special status. *United States v. Tedder*, 24 M.J. 176, 182 (C.M.A. 1987). The Court of Military Appeals has endorsed subjecting officers to more stringent punishments for their violations of the UCMJ than might be appropriate for an enlisted member under the same circumstances. *United States v. Moultak*, 24 M.J. 316, 318 (C.M.A. 1987). We find no merit in this assignment of error. We conclude that the findings and the sentence are correct in law and fact, the sentence is not inappropriate, and no error prejudicial to the substantial rights of the appellant was committed.

Accordingly, the findings of guilty and the sentence are correct in law and fact and are

AFFIRMED.

Senior Judge HEIMBURG and Judge GAMBOA concur.

[SEAL]

OFFICIAL

/s/ Alvin J. Stribling
ALVIN J. STRIBLING
Technical Sergeant, USAF
Chief Court Administrator

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1997 90176 66004